

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From the INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

PCT

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

(PCT Rule 43bis.1)

To: See Form PCT/ISA/220	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 60%;">Date of mailing (Day/month/year)</td> <td style="width: 40%;">See Form PCT/ISA/210 (sheet 2)</td> </tr> </table>	Date of mailing (Day/month/year)	See Form PCT/ISA/210 (sheet 2)
Date of mailing (Day/month/year)	See Form PCT/ISA/210 (sheet 2)		
Applicant's or agent's file reference See Form PCT/ISA/220	FOR FURTHER ACTION See paragraph 2 below		
International file reference PCT/EP2004/010141	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 60%;"> International filing date (Day/Month/Year) 10/09/2004 </td> <td style="width: 40%;"> Priority date (Day/Month/Year) 16/10/2003 </td> </tr> </table>	International filing date (Day/Month/Year) 10/09/2004	Priority date (Day/Month/Year) 16/10/2003
International filing date (Day/Month/Year) 10/09/2004	Priority date (Day/Month/Year) 16/10/2003		
International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC D01H13/32			
Applicant SAURER GMBH & CO. KG			

1.	This opinion contains indications relating to the following items: <table style="width: 100%; margin-top: 10px;"> <tr> <td style="width: 10%;"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td> <td style="width: 20%;">Box No. I</td> <td>Basis of the opinion</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td> <td>Box No. II</td> <td>Priority</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td> <td>Box No. III</td> <td>Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td>Box No. IV</td> <td>Lack of unity of invention</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td>Box No. V</td> <td>Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td>Box No. VI</td> <td>Certain documents cited</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td>Box No. VII</td> <td>Certain defects in the international application</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td>Box No. VIII</td> <td>Certain observations on the international application</td> </tr> </table>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Box No. I	Basis of the opinion	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Box No. II	Priority	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Box No. III	Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability	<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. IV	Lack of unity of invention	<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. V	Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement	<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. VI	Certain documents cited	<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. VII	Certain defects in the international application	<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. VIII	Certain observations on the international application
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Box No. I	Basis of the opinion																							
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Box No. II	Priority																							
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Box No. III	Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability																							
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. IV	Lack of unity of invention																							
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. V	Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement																							
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. VI	Certain documents cited																							
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. VII	Certain defects in the international application																							
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. VIII	Certain observations on the international application																							
2.	FURTHER ACTION If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered. If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of 3 months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later. For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.																								
3.	For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220																								

Name and mailing address of the ISA European Patent Office – P.B. 5818 Patentlaan 2 NL-2280 HV Rijswijk – Netherlands Tel. +31 70 340 -2040, Tx: 31 651 epo nl Fax: +31 70 340 - 3016	Authorised officer D'Souza, J Tel. +31 70 340 – 4236 <div style="text-align: right;">EPO stamp</div>
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

10/575688

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

**International Application No.
PCT/EP2004/010141**

AP20 Rec'd PCT/PTO 13 APR 2006

Box No. I Basis of this opinion

1. With regard to the **language**, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, if nothing else is stated under this item.

☐ The opinion is based on a translation from the original language into the following, which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b)).
2. With regard to any **nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence** disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
 - a. type of material
☐ a sequence listing
☐ table(s) related to the sequence listing
 - b. format of material
☐ on paper
☐ in electronic form
 - c. time of filing/furnishing
☐ contained in the international application as filed
☐ filed together with the international application in electronic form
☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search
3. ☐ In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table(s) relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.
4. Additional comments:

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

**International Application No.
PCT/EP2004/010141**

Box No. II Priority

1. ☒ The following document has not yet been filed:

☒ Copy of the earlier application, the priority of which is claimed (Rule 43*bis*.1 and 66.7(a)).

☐ Translation of the earlier application, the priority of which is claimed (Rule 43*bis*.1 and 66.7(b)).

 It was therefore not possible to check the validity of the priority claim. The opinion has nevertheless been established on the assumption that the relevant date is the claimed priority date.

2. ☐ This opinion has been established as if no priority has been claimed due to the fact that the priority claim has been found invalid (Rules 43*bis*.1 and 64.1). Thus for the purposes of this opinion, the international filing date indicated above is considered to be the relevant date.

3. ☐ It was not possible to check the validity of the priority claim, due to the fact that no copy of the priority document was available to the International Searching Authority at the time of the search (Rule 17.1). This opinion was therefore established assuming that the relevant date for the examination is the claimed priority date.

4. Additional observations, if necessary:

**International Application No.
PCT/EP2004/010141**

The questions whether the claimed invention appears to be novel, to involve an inventive step (to be non obvious), or to be industrially applicable have not been examined in respect of the following parts of the application

- because:**

- Form PCT/ISA/237 (January 2004)

10/575688

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING
AUTHORITY (SUPPLEMENTARY SHEET)**

IP20 Rec'd PCT/PTO 12 APR 2006
International Application No.
PCT/EP2004/010141

Item III

**Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial
applicability**

A reasonable search on the basis of all the claims is not possible, as these relate to – presentation of information – Rule 39.1(v) PCT. See PCT Guidelines 9.11 – 9.14.